

REMARKS

Claims 21-38 are in the case.

In the parent application, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103 over Danielson U.S. Patent 4,082,706. This rejection was affirmed by the Board of Appeals by its decision of October 10, 2003, a copy of which is enclosed.

This application has been refiled in order for the Applicants to more particularly define their invention.

Specifically, it is pointed out that the enamines used in the cited reference are added solely for the purpose of imparting ozone resistance to the rubber stock, not for accelerating the vulcanization. In the present invention, however, the enamines are present for the purpose of accelerating vulcanization, not for the purpose of imparting ozone resistance to the rubber. Note in particular, page 4, lines 22-24 of the specification, as well as Claim 38. The artisan clearly would have no reason or motivation to add an enamine for the purpose of vulcanizing the rubber, particularly when, as in Danielson, a vulcanization accelerator is already present and the enamine is not known to be effective for this purpose.

An action on the merits of the claims is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

Samuel H. Blech
Registration No. 32,082

NFO:SHB/bu